

What I do not want to happen is for this provision to stay in which cuts off the funds. We do need a supplemental. I would encourage that. That is why I have left section B untouched. We encourage and require the President to send a supplemental in the future.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to serve with the gentleman on the National Security Caucus, and the gentleman does an outstanding job in that. I am going to join the gentleman and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the chairman of the committee in the effort he speaks of, but I believe we ought to perceive this on a bipartisan basis.

I will be speaking about what I think the President's role has been and what Congress' role has been, both parties, in terms of under funding our defense. We have not passed bills that were adequate to the task. The President has not vetoed any bills. We simply have not passed them. I want to work with the gentleman, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I begin by offering my congratulations and thanks to the men and women in uniform who have done such a fantastic job in the Balkans. I hope that they and their families are listening and understand the unanimous feeling of pride and support for what they have done.

The question before us this afternoon is what do we do next? This bill offers a good prescription for what not to do next, because if this bill becomes law, on the 30th of September, whatever efforts we are making to sustain the peace that has been won will terminate. Now, that is a shortsighted and I believe irrational approach to solving this problem. So we need to amend the bill.

With all due respect, I do not think we need to amend the bill in the way that our friends from Florida and Indiana have proposed amending it, because they say before we could put peacekeeping forces in, as I understand it, since they are ground forces, there would have to be specific Congressional authorization.

What clearly has happened is that the objectives of this campaign are being realized. The refugees are going home, the Serbian troops are being withdrawn, and the objectives are being realized. To force us to go through a process now where we cannot follow through on this decision that

has been made until there has been a debate and vote here I think would be a mistake. It would be an equally grave mistake to tie the President's hands and to terminate his authority on the 30th of September, a truly arbitrary deadline.

The right amendment to support is the Skelton amendment. It says the right thing, that the President in fact should come to this body for a supplemental appropriation and not pay for these operations out of the regular military budget. I agree with that. But it does not make the mistake of unduly tying the hands of the commander-in-chief and restraining him and our military leaders from following through on the peace that has been won with such valor and distinction in the last few weeks and months.

I strongly support the Skelton amendment; oppose the others.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, years ago when George McGovern ran for president, our current President and National Security Adviser worked in his campaign. Sandy Berger supposedly even coined the phrase "come home America." Our boys of the Vietnam era have now grown up. It has gone from come home America to go everywhere America, to stay everywhere America.

We do have the best military in the world. Nobody is disputing that. We are proud of them. But they can only do so much with poorly conceived political strategies.

This is certainly no victory. After 11 weeks of bombing, we have less world stability than when we started. After 11 weeks of bombing, we have a settlement that we probably could have achieved at the beginning. If this is a victory, what would a defeat look like? We are not snatching defeat from the jaws of victory, we are trying to snatch future victories from the jaws of this defeat.

Let me look at the specifics here. We probably have destabilized Montenegro, although hopefully we can get the pro-western government stabilized.

We certainly have put Macedonia at risk, which was a country where all the factions had pulled together, watched their trade get devastated, and now potentially have changed the mix and the politics of Macedonia.

We have set a precedent on autonomous semi-independent republics, and it is not clear whether Kosovo can actually stay under Serbian control. What does this mean for Palestine? What does this mean for the Kurds? Have we taken a foreign policy change and had a potential impact around the world?

What about internal interventions? What does this mean for Chechnya, what does this mean if there are Tiananmen Squares? Are we going to

intervene in other countries, with terrible tragedies and the genocide in those countries. We do not have a clear policy of how and when we are going to intervene.

Furthermore, has this advanced the stability with Russia, has this advanced the stability with China, where we clearly have national interests and world peace interests. I would argue no.

Furthermore, we have disproportionately pinned down our forces in an area of the world where we do not have clear national interests, and where, after 700 or 1,500 or 2,000 years of fighting, we are unlikely at the second we pull out not to see reoccurrences. As long as Pristina is conceived as the Jerusalem of the Serbian people, they are not likely, whether it takes 20 years or 50 years or 200 years, to change that attitude.

Furthermore, why did I say that about the peace settlement? Milosevic remains in power. He keeps his military. Furthermore, we now disarm his enemies, the KLA. We have Russian troops, his friends, as part of the thing. I am not arguing against these points. I am saying this is something that he probably would have taken in the beginning.

Furthermore, it is under UN at this point, under UN control, where China has a veto in the Security Council. We do not even know what the Russian government is going to be like after the next elections, and we probably are going to be there a lot more than 3 months.

So you look at this and say, why is this peace settlement a defeat for Milosevic? He has moved the Kosovars out. He does not have enough Serbians to occupy that whole territory. We are looking at 100,000-some versus 1 million people. He wanted his enemies disarmed, and we are going to do that.

I do not think this in any way can be called a victory.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the NATO mission in Yugoslavia has prevailed over the brutal dictatorship of Slobodan Milosevic. NATO has shown tremendous resolve, tremendous persistence, throughout this crisis. Now that this diplomatic resolution has been reached on NATO's terms, on NATO's terms, this is not the time to show weakness, to cut funding or to damage the unity of the western democracies.

What can the proponents of this bill be thinking by cutting funding for peacekeeping? This is not the Republican party of my father or the Republican party of my grandfather. I learned around the dinner table that the primary rule of foreign policy was politics ends at the water's edge.

The modern Republican Party in this House seems to have forgotten that lesson. They seem to be setting foreign